

Effect of Work Place Environment Factors on Performance of Employees: Empirical Study on Wollo University Staffs

Kidanie Aragaw Alemu (✉ karagaw7@gmail.com)

Wollo University <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2507-6269>

Research Article

Keywords: Employee performance, Wollo university, Workplace environment factors

Posted Date: April 15th, 2022

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1560832/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Workplace environment is the environment in which people work that include physical setting, job profile, culture and market condition while performance is the development of quantified objectives. This study focuses on measuring the effect of workplace environment factors on performance of Wollo University: the case of College of Business and Economics employees. The researcher would use a causal research design and apply multistage sampling technique, and collect data from 66 selected employees by adopting questionnaire data collection method. The researcher planned to analyze the research data by using simple descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Forty seven percent of the respondents had worked with the university for less than 5 years; 28.8% of the respondents had worked for the university between 6–10 years, and 24.2% of the respondents had worked for the university for more than 10 years. The findings indicated all workplace environment factors had positive linear relationship with their workplace performance in the university. The findings on the modeling of the employees' performance against the workplace environment factors showed at 5% significant level the multiple linear regression model was statistically significant (p-value 0.001). Among the workplace environment factors at 5% significant level employees' performance was affected by their work life balance (p-value 0.002). Most of the respondents had worked in the university for more than six years. Work life balance of employees and reward for employees had strong linear association with their workplace performance. In the university the employees' performance was affected by their workplace environment factors.

1. Introduction

According to Tripathi (2014) the work environment can be defined as the environment in which people work that include physical setting, job profile, culture and market condition. Each aspect is interlinked and impacts on employee's overall performance and productivity. It is the quality of the employees' workplace environment that most impacts on their level of motivation subsequently performance. Work environment can be thought of simply as the environment in which people work (Briner, 2000) as such; it is a very broad category that encompasses the physical setting (e.g., heat, equipment), characteristics of the job itself (e.g., workload, task complexity). He adds that it also encompasses broader organizational features (e.g., culture, history) and even aspects of the external organizational setting (e.g., local labor market conditions, industry sector, work life balance).

Armstrong (2006) defines performance as the development of quantified objectives. Performance is not only a matter of what people achieve but how they achieve. High performance is a step towards the achievement of organizational goals and tasks. Frese and Sonnentag (2000) opined that an individual performance is highly important for an organization as a whole and the individuals working in it. Organizations need highly performing employees in order to meet their goals and to deliver the products and services they are specialized in and finally to achieve a competitive advantage.

This study is grounded on the two-factor theory (Herzberg, 1986). Herzberg came to a conclusion that the aspects of the work environment that satisfy employees are different from the aspects that dissatisfy

them. The theory points out that improving the environment in which the job is performed motivates employees to perform better. The other theory is Weiss and Cropanzano's Affective Events Theory (AET) which explains the link between internal influences and their reactions to incidents that occur in their work environment that affect employee performance, organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Thompson & Phua, 2012).

There are many factors that affect the performance of employees in organizations. Workplace environment plays an essential role towards workers' performance and productivity in any organization (El-Zeiny, 2013). Providing a good workplace environment increases employee performance in organizations (Shikdar & Sawaqed, 2003). When people are working in situations that suit their physical and mental abilities, the correct fit between the person and work task is accomplished. Employees are then in the optimum situation for learning, working and achieving. Work environment comprises the totality of forces and influential factors that are currently or potentially contending with the employees' activities and performance. According to Chandrasekar (2011) there are key factors like physical work place environment, reward, management and leadership style, training and development, and work-life balance that could give a great impact towards the motivation and performance level. The business environment is becoming very competitive, dynamic and complex. Management should therefore find ways to ensure that workplace environment is conducive enough to enable employee performance in order to remain competitive.

The success of any organization is closely tied to the job performance of its employees. The quality of the employees' workplace environment impacts on their motivation level and hence performance (Heath, 2006). When employees have the desire, physically and emotionally to work, then their performance shall be increased (Boles et al., 2004). They also stated that having a proper workplace environment helps in reducing the number of absenteeism and as a result can increase the performance in today's competitive and dynamic business world. The workplace environment that is set in place impacts employee morale, productivity and engagement -both positively and negatively (Chandrasekar, 2011). Chandrasekar adds that factors of workplace environment play an important role towards the employees' performance. The factors of workplace environment give an immense impact to the employees' performance either towards the negative outcomes or the positive outcomes.

Employees will always be contended when they feel that their immediate environment states are in tandem with their obligations (Farh et al., 2012). Chandrasekar (2011) asserts that the type of workplace environment in which employees operate determines whether or not organizations will prosper. The workplace environment consists of physical factors which include the office layout and design among other factors; while the psychosocial factors include working conditions, role congruity and social support. Other aspects of the workplace environment are the policies which include employment conditions. A better physical workplace environment boosts employees' performance (Chandrasekar, 2011).

Empirical studies done include Gitahi (2014) who looked at the Effect of Workplace Environment on Performance of Commercial Banks Employees in Nakuru Town and the findings showed that psychosocial aspects were an important factor in boosting the performance of employees than the physical workplace factors and work life factors. Naharuddin and Sadegi (2013) did a study on Factors of Workplace Environment that Affect Employees' Performance: A case of Miyazu Malaysia. The findings showed that only supervisor support was not significant towards the employees' performance while job aid and physical workplace environment had a significant relationship towards employees' performance. Amusa et al. (2013) studied Work Environments and Job Performance of Librarians in Public Universities in South-West Nigeria. The findings revealed that there was significant correlation between work environment and job performance in libraries.

Employees in many organizations are encountering with working problems related to workplace environmental and physical factors. It has been argued by Pech and Slade (2006) that employee disengagement is increasing and it has become important to make workplaces that positively influence workforce. Employees' comfort on the job, determined by workplace conditions and environment, has been recognized as an important factor for measuring their productivity (Leblebici, 2012). In today's dynamic and competitive business world, a healthy workplace environment makes good business sense. Managers should not just focus on the employees' pay packet with the assumption that it is proportionate to performance (Heath, 2006). Organizations deemed as a positive place to work will have a competitive edge over the others.

Platt and Sobotka (2010) assert that employee performance is the combined result of effort, ability and perception of tasks. The factors that affect the level of individual performance are motivation, ability and opportunity to participate (Armstrong, 2006). He perceives performance as a function of ability and motivation. There are a number of factors that affect employee performance, the workplace environment impacts most their level of motivation hence their performance. Stup (2003) describes several factors towards the success of employees' performance. These factors include physical environment, equipment, meaningful work, performance expectation, feedback on performance, bad system among others. He adds that, to have a standard performance, employers have to get the employees task done on track so as to achieve the organizational goals.

Teklehaimanot et al. (2007) also conducted a study on Health Extension Workers' working conditions in the Ethiopian context. (Luna, 2017) also looked at the effect of working environment on employee performance in Ayka Addis textile and investment group plc. The finding showed that there was significant relationship between physical working environment and employee performance and training have no relationship with employee performance.

Further Awoke (2019) conducted a study on Bole Lemi Industrial Park workers working conditions in the Ethiopian context. The finding showed that there is significant relationship between physical working environment, reward, training and employee performance but leadership style and work life balance had no relationship with employee performance.

Working place environment factors like physical environment, workplace reward, leadership style, work life balance and training have their own impact on employee performance in organizations. Universities are among the organizations. In universities, there is cut throat competition; the employer is faced with the challenge of attracting, retaining and motivating the employees. These employees are faced with a myriad of problems in relation to their work environment. This is especially in terms of mobility at the workplace and compensation. In order to reach their organizational peak performance, the universities must be able to create a workplace environment where employees are motivated to work. (Boles et al., 2004) state that when employees have physical and emotional desire to work, then their performance shall be increased. In universities there are special importance of maximizing employee performance. Hence, the researcher is interested to see the impact of working place environment factors on employee performance in detail. Therefore, the current study tried to see the effects of working place environment factors on performance of Wollo university employees in the case of College of Business and Economics workers.

Taking the above background information this research would try to address the following research questions.

- How physical workplace environment affects Wollo university employees' performance?
- Does reward have an effect on Wollo university employees' performance?
- Does management and leadership style have effect on Wollo university employee's performance?
- Does training and development have effect on Wollo university employee's performance?
- How work-life balance contributes to Wollo university employee's performance?

2. Material And Methods

Ketchen Jr and Bergh (2006) defines methodology as the systematic theoretical analysis of the methods applied to a field of study. This chapter therefore discusses various components of methodology that was used in the study. These include the research design, target population, data collection procedures and data analysis.

2.1 Research Design

Causal research design was used in analyzing the research data. The design is going to be preferred because it is concerned with answering questions such as why, how, and by how much. This design uses quantitative data analysis.

2.2 Study Area

Wollo University is one of the federal universities built among a group of 2nd generation universities in Ethiopia. It has two campuses: Dessie and Kombolcha. Being located in the South Wollo Zone of the Amhara State, the University is designed to be a center of learning and research in a wide range of fields

to meet the growing demand of trained manpower of the country. It is 411 kilo meters far from Addis Ababa to the north.

2.3 Population of the Study

The target population of this study was all employees of Wollo university. While the study population was all Wollo university college of business and economics employees. During the study period there were total of 78 workers in the college.

2.4 Sample Design

Employees in this University are working in different colleges. The researcher would take these colleges as clusters and select one sample college randomly. From the selected cluster the researcher would use simple random sampling technique to select the sampled employees since it requires less time to select the sample and collect data from the selected sample employees.

2.5 Sample Size Determination

In business and economics college, Dessie campus, there were 78 employees. Out of this employee the researcher uses the following samples based on Yamane (1967) sample size determination formula. The level of confidence was 95%, so the significant level, $e = 1 - 0.95 = 0.05 = 5\%$.

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} = \frac{78}{1 + 78 * 0.05^2} = \frac{78}{1 + 0.195} = \frac{78}{1.195} = 65.272 \approx 66$$

Where n is the sample size, e is the significant level and N is the population size.

2.6 Type and Source of Data

For this research the researcher would use primary data collected from the selected employees and secondary data about the size of the employees in the college obtained from human resource office that enable the researcher to determine the sample size. So, the type of data source for this research would be both primary and secondary source.

2.7 Data Collection

Primary data would be used and it would be obtained through semi-structured questionnaire. This method allows for the respondents to receive the same set of questions in exactly the same manner. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) closed-ended questions are simple to formulate and flexible.

2.8 Method of Data Analysis and Interpretation

Descriptive statistics which include frequencies and percentages would be applied to establish patterns and trends for easy understanding and interpretation of the findings, and inferential statistics such as Pearson correlation and multiple linear regression analysis were used to see the associations of factors of workplace environment and their effect on employee performance.

3. Results

3.1 Response Rate

A total of 66 questionnaires were issued. Out of these questionnaires all were returned duly completed. This represents 100% response rate.

3.2 Demographic Characteristics of the Sample Employees

The demographic characteristics considered in the study were gender, age, service year and level of education.

The study sought to identify gender composition of the respondents to determine the extent of gender disparity and to ensure that the study was representative. The results are presented in Table 1. The result shows that 74.2% were males while 25.8% were females. The study had unequal ratios of male and female respondents.

Table 1
Sex of Employees

Sex	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
• Female	17	25.8	25.8
• Male	49	74.2	100.0
Total	66	100.0	

The researcher sought to establish the age distribution of the respondents to ensure that the view of different age range was taken into consideration. The results are presented in Table 2. As Table 2 indicated in 28.8% were below the age of 30 years; 51.5% were in the age bracket 30–39 years while 18.2% were between 40–50 years of age. Only 1.5% were in the age bracket of 51–60 years. This was indication that most of the respondents were below the age 40 years.

Table 2
Age of Employees

Age	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
• Below 30 years	19	28.8	28.8
• 30–39 years	34	51.5	80.3
• 40–49 years	12	18.2	98.5
• 50–60 years	1	1.5	100.0
Total	66	100.0	
Source: Own survey data, 2021			

The study sought to determine the length of service of the respondents to establish whether they had attained adequate experience to provide accurate and reliable information. Table 3 outlines the results. The results show that 47% of the respondents had worked with the university for less than 5 years; 28.8% of the respondents had worked for the university between 6–10 years, and 24.2% of the respondents had worked for the university for more than 10 years.

Table 3
Experience of Employees in Wollo University

Length of service in the university	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
• Below 5 years	31	47.0	47.0
• 6–10 years	19	28.8	75.8
• above 10 years	16	24.2	100.0
Total	66	100.0	
Source: Own survey data, 2021			

The researcher sought to establish the distribution of the level of education of the respondents. The level of education encompasses knowledge and skills which enabled the researcher to understand the perception levels of the respondents. Table 4 shows the results. From the findings 31.8% of the respondents had degree; 7.6% had diploma; 47% had masters; 12.1% had doctorate degrees and 1.5% had certificate level of education. It was concluded that a majority of the respondents had degrees and master degree.

Table 4
Education Level of Employees

Education level	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
• Certificate	1	1.5	1.5
• Diploma	5	7.6	9.1
• Degree	21	31.8	40.9
• Master degree	31	47.0	87.9
• PhD	8	12.1	100.0
Total	66	100.0	
Source: Own survey data, 2021			

3.3 Descriptive Analysis of Workplace Environment Factors for the Sample Employees

The researcher sought to determine the level of agreement of employees concerning the different workplace environment factors package that have an effect on their performance. The results were depicted in the accompanying tables and paragraphs for each package.

The results in Table 5 indicate that the respondents agreed that furniture was comfortable enough to enable them to perform their jobs (Mean = 2.58); undisturbed work environment devoid of noise made the employees perform better at their job (mean = 2.3). The findings showed majority of the respondents agreed that a better work environment with enough space and lighting would make them better perform at their job (mean = 2.79). In all the cases it should be noted that the physical work environment can spur employee's performance.

Table 5
Descriptive statistics of Employee physical workplace Environment packages vs. their Ratings

Physical workplace environment packages	Rating Scale				Mean	Std. Deviation
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree		
	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)		
My furniture is comfortable enough to enable me perform my jobs without getting tired	10 (15.2)	20 (30.3)	24 (36.4)	12 (18.2)	2.58	.962
My workplace provides an undisturbed environment without any noise that gives me alone time to perform my duties.	12 (18.2)	22 (33.3)	28 (42.4)	4 (6.1)	2.36	.853
I am happy with my office space and arrangement.	13 (19.7)	20(30.3)	21 (31.8)	12 (18.2)	2.48	1.011
A better work environment (spacious office, enough lighting etc.) will make me perform better at my job.	4 (6.1)	22 (33.3)	24 (36.4)	16 (24.2)	2.79	.886
Source: Own survey data, 2021						

From the results shown in Table 6, the respondents disagreed that the university provided opportunities for promotion for high performance (Mean = 2.17). A big percentage disagreed that financial support for learning programs motivated them perform better at work (the percentage was 36.4% with a mean = 2.38). The respondents disagreed that they were fairly compensated for work done (mean = 2.23). Majority of the respondents disagreed that the university provided incentives that generally supported their work (Mean = 2.15). The analysis indicated that incentives, wages paid and other rewards were not satisfactory hence encouraging the employees not to better perform their duties.

Table 6
Descriptive statistics of Employee reward packages vs. their Ratings

Employee reward package	Rating Scale				Mean	Std. Deviation
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree		
	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)		
My organization provides opportunities for promotion for high performing employees.	18(27.3)	25 (37.9)	17 (25.8)	6 (9.1)	2.17	.938
Financial support for learning programs motivates me to perform better at work.	13 (9.7)	24 (36.4)	20 (30.3)	9 (13.6)	2.38	.957
I am compensated fairly for the work I do.	13 (19.7)	31 (47.0)	16 (24.2)	6 (9.1)	2.23	.873
My organization provides incentives that generally support my work.	18 (27.3)	27 (40.9)	14 (21.2)	7 (10.6)	2.15	.949
Source: Own survey data, 2021						

The findings in Table 7 indicate, the respondents agreed that their managers role modeled high standards of quality performance as indicated by the response rate (42.4% and a mean = 2.52). However, they disagreed that their managers gave them a clear picture of the direction of the organization (Mean = 2.29). This can highly affect the motivation of the employees hence affecting their performance. Majority of the respondents also disagreed that management involved them in decision making on ways to improve performance (Mean = 2.36); respondents were agreed that they could able to contact management or work hand in hand with their superiors (Mean = 2.52). The analysis implied that management did not give a clear picture of the future of the organization which can highly impact performance but the management style was flexible enough to allow good communication between the superiors and other employees hence encouraging performance in their university.

Table 7
Descriptive statistics of leadership style packages vs. their Ratings

Leadership style packages	Rating Scale			Mean	Std. deviation	
	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree			
Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)			
My manager role models high standards for quality performance.	6 (9.1)	26 (39.4)	28 (42.4)	6 (9.1)	2.52	.789
Senior management gives staff a clear picture of the direction in which the organization is headed hence motivating me to work.	10 (15.5)	30 (45.5)	23 (34.8)	3 (4.5)	2.29	.780
Management involves staff decision making.	9 (13.6)	30 (45.5)	21 (31.8)	6 (9.1)	2.36	.835
I am able to contact senior management or work hand in hand with my superior at the workplace.	7 (10.6)	23 (34.8)	31 (47)	5 (7.6)	2.52	.789
Source: Own survey data, 2021						

From the findings in Table 8 show that the respondents disagreed that their organization provided training and development to do their work well (Mean = 2.27). They also disagreed that their organization helped them identify training and development needs through performance appraisals (Mean = 2.2). In addition, the respondents disagreed that their organization monitored all the training and development plans to ensure employee performance (Mean = 2.24). This analysis implied that the university would not encourage training and enhanced performance of the employees.

Table 8
Descriptive statistics of Employee training packages vs. their Ratings

Employee training packages	Rating Scale				Mean	Std. deviation
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree		
	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)		
My organization provides training and development to the employees	13 (19.7)	26 (39.4)	23 (34.8)	4 (6.1)	2.27	.851
My organization helps me identify my training and development needs through performance appraisals.	14 (21.2)	28 (42.4)	21 (31.8)	3 (4.5)	2.20	.827
The organization ensures that training and development plans are developed and monitored for all employees thus helping manage employee performance.	11 (16.7)	30 (45.5)	23 (34.8)	2 (3)	2.24	.766
Source: Own survey data, 2021						

The findings show in Table 9 indicates that the respondents agreed that they were able to balance work priorities with their personal life as indicated by a mean = 2.88; they also agreed that their organizations provide flexi-time to enable them balance work and personal life (Mean = 2.88). further they agreed that they were given leave to attend to personal issues (Mean = 2.64). The analysis can therefore be interpreted that work life balance was of great importance to performance of employees Wollo university employees because when they were able to balance work and personal life, employees can focus and perform better.

Table 9
Descriptive statistics of work life balance of employee's package vs. their Ratings

Work life balance of employee's packages	Rating Scale				Mean	Std. Deviation
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree		
	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)		
I am able to balance work priorities with my personal life.	2 (3)	17 (25.8)	34 (51.5)	13 (19.7)	2.88	.755
My organization provides flexi-time to be able to balance my work and personal life.	2 (3)	16 (24.2)	36 (54.5)	12 (18.2)	2.88	.734
My organization recognizes the need for leave in order to give employees time off work to relax and attend also to personal issues.	3 (4.5)	25 (37.9)	31 (47.0)	7 (10.6)	2.64	.737
Source: Own survey data, 2021						

3.4 Correlation Analysis of Workplace Environment Factors and Employee Performance

The researcher sought to determine whether the workplace environment factors had linear association with the employees' performance. The findings are provided in Table 10 below. As Table 10 indicates in at 5 and 1 percent significant level all workplace environment factors i.e., workplace physical environment, reward for employees, management/ leadership style, training or development given for employees and work life balance of employees had positive linear relationship with their work place performance. The table also shows that work life balance of employees and reward for employees had strong linear association with their workplace performance while the rest factors had weak positive linear relationship.

Table 10
Correlation Matrix of Workplace Environment Factors with Employee Performance

Workplace environment factors	Employee performance	
• Employee workplace physical environment	Pearson Correlation	0.245*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.048
	N	66
• Reward for employee	Pearson Correlation	0.339**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.005
	N	66
• Management/ Leadership style	Pearson Correlation	0.260*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.035
	N	66
• Training or development given for employees	Pearson Correlation	0.315*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.010
	N	66
• Work life balance of employees	Pearson Correlation	0.505**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	66
*, Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).		
**, Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).		

3.5 Multiple Linear Regression

The researcher sought to model the employees' performance against the workplace environment factors to see whether the factors had effect on their performance. The results are shown in Table 11. As Table 11 shows at 5% significant level the multiple linear regression model was statistically significant since p-value or significant level value 0.001 was much less than 0.05. This indicated that in Wollo university the employee's performance was affected by their workplace environment factors.

Table 11
ANOVA table of employee performance Vs. Workplace environment factors

ANOVA^a					
Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
• Regression	4.130	5	0.826	4.793	0.001 ^b
• Residual	10.340	60	0.172		
Total	14.470	65			
a. Dependent Variable: employee performance					
b. Predictors: (Constant), Work life balance of employees, Training or development given for employees, Employee workplace physical environment, Management/ Leadership style, Reward for employee					

After checking whether the model was statistically significant at 5% significant level the researcher sought which workplace environment factors had effect on their performance. The results are indicated in Table 12. Table 12 shows that at 5% significant level only work life balance of Wollo university employees affected their work performance since p-value 0.002 much less than 0.05 while the rest factors did not have statistically significant effect on their work performance since their p-values were much more than 0.05.

Table 12
Multiple Linear regression Coefficients of workplace environment factors vs. Employee performance

Coefficients^a					
Workplace environment factors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
• (Constant)	1.358	0.325		4.184	0.000
• Employee workplace physical environment	0.026	0.084	0.038	0.317	0.752
• Reward for employee	0.076	0.094	0.113	0.803	0.425
• Management/ Leadership style	0.009	0.105	0.011	0.082	0.935
• Training or development given for employees	0.059	0.094	0.087	0.628	0.532
• Work life balance of employees	0.381	0.119	0.411	3.193	0.002
a. Dependent Variable: employee performance					

4. Discussion

The aim of this study was to see the effect of workplace environment factors on performance of Wollo university employees. The variables considered were demographic characteristics, workplace environment factors and performance of the employees.

The demographic characteristics considered in the study were gender, age, service year in the university and level of education of employees. The study sought to identify gender composition of the respondents and the result showed that 74.2% were males while 25.8% were females. This indicated that there were unequal ratios of male and female respondents. In addition, the researcher sought to establish the age distribution of the respondents. The result indicated in 28.8% were below the age of 30 years; 51.5% were in the age bracket 30–39 years while 18.2% were between 40–50 years of age. Only 1.5% were in the age bracket of 51–60 years. This was indication that most of the employees were below the age 40 years. The study further sought to see the distribution of the length of service of the employees. The results showed that 47% of the respondents had worked with the university for less than 5 years; 28.8% of the respondents had worked for the university between 6–10 years, and 24.2% of the respondents had worked for the university for more than 10 years. Also, the researcher sought to establish the distribution of the level of education of the employees. From the findings 31.8% of the respondents had degree; 7.6% had diploma; 47% had masters; 12.1% had doctorate degrees and 1.5% had certificate level of education. It was concluded that a majority of the respondents had first and second degree.

Concerning physical work environment, the results indicated the respondents agreed that furniture was comfortable enough to enable them to perform their jobs; undisturbed work environment devoid of noise made the employees perform better at their job; majority of the respondents agreed that a better work environment with enough space and lighting would make them better perform at their job. In all the cases it should be noted that the physical work environment can spur employee's performance.

Regarding to reward the results showed that the respondents disagreed that the university provided opportunities for promotion for high performance. A big percentage disagreed that financial support for learning programs motivated them perform better at work. The respondents disagreed that they were fairly compensated for work done. Majority of the respondents disagreed that the university provided incentives that generally supported their work. The analysis indicated that incentives, wages paid and other rewards were not satisfactory hence encouraging the employees not to better perform their duties.

About management style the findings indicated the respondents agreed that their managers role modeled high standards of quality performance as indicated by the response rate (42.4% and a mean = 2.52). However, they disagreed that their managers gave them a clear picture of the direction of the organization. This can highly affect the motivation of the employees hence affecting their performance. Majority of the respondents also disagreed that management involved them in decision making on ways to improve performance; respondents were agreed that they could able to contact management or work hand in hand with their superiors. The analysis implied that management did not give a clear picture of the future of the organization which can highly impact performance but the management style was flexible enough to

allow good communication between the superiors and other employees hence encouraging performance in their university.

Looking to training and development given to employees the findings showed that the respondents disagreed that their organization provided training and development to do their work well. They also disagreed that their organization helped them identify training and development needs through performance appraisals. In addition, the respondents disagreed that their organization monitored all the training and development plans to ensure employee performance. This analysis implied that the university would not encourage training and this did not enhance the employees to perform better.

Seeing work life balance factor, the findings indicated that the respondents agreed that they were able to balance work priorities with their personal life; they also agreed that their organizations provide flexi-time to enable them balance work and personal life. Further they agreed that they were given leave to attend to personal issues. The analysis can therefore be interpreted that work life balance was of great importance to performance of employees in Wollo university because when they were able to balance work and personal life, employees can focus and perform better.

The researcher sought to determine whether the workplace environment factors had linear association with Wollo university employees' performance. The findings indicated in all workplace environment factors i.e., workplace physical environment, reward for employees, management/ leadership style, training or development given for employees and work life balance of employees had positive linear relationship with their work place performance in the university. This result was coincided with the study done by (Teklehaimanot et al., 2007), (Luna, 2017), (Amusa et al., 2013), (Naharuddin & Sadegi, 2013), and (Awoke, 2019). The result also showed that work life balance of employees and reward for employees had strong linear association with their workplace performance while the rest factors had weak positive linear relationship.

The researcher also sought to model the employees' performance against the workplace environment factors to see whether the factors had effect on their performance. The findings showed that at 5% significant level the multiple linear regression model was statistically significant since p-value or significant level value 0.001 was much less than 5%. This indicated that in Wollo university the employees' performance was affected by their workplace environment factors. This result was in line with the study done by (Nel et al., 2004), (Roelofsen, 2002), (Mullins, 2006) and (Hammer et al., 2004).

Further the researcher sought which individual workplace environment factors had effect on their performance in the university. The findings indicated in at 5% significant level Wollo university employees' performance was affected by their work life balance. This result was similar to the study done by (Clark, 2000), (Nel et al., 2004), (Roelofsen, 2002), (Mullins, 2006) and (Hammer et al., 2004). While the rest factors did not have statistically significant effect on their work performance. This result contradicted with the study done by (Niemelä et al., 2002), (Al-Anzi, 2009), (Hameed & Amjad, 2009), (Ajala, 2012), (Khan et al., 2011), (Aisha et al., 2013), (Ajila & Abiola, 2004), (San et al., 2012), (Storey, 2004), (Duckett & Macfarlane, 2003), (Armstrong, 2006), (Tzafir, 2005) and (Riketta, 2002).

The study will enable management in the universities to find ways to create an enabling workplace environment to employees in order to motivate them to perform. It will enlighten the managers on the various workplace environment factors that may affect employee performance and hence the necessary improvements. Policy makers in the University education Sector will obtain knowledge about the aspects of workplace environment that affect performance. They will therefore get a head start on formulating the appropriate policies that enhance favorable working environments. The study will add to existing literature on workplace environment and the factors that impact employee performance. Scholars in Human Resource practice can use the study as reference for further research on the topic or related topics. Further the study contributes for the researcher to scale up its level and gain research experience.

5. Conclusion And Recommendations

The most important resource for an organization is the human resources who are the employees. They make sufficient contribution to an organization; attention should therefore be paid to them. Organizations can only realize their goals and objectives through its employees' performance. Employees will strive to perform when they feel that their immediate environment state corresponds with their obligations. The type of work environment in which they operate will determine whether they perform or not, it's through their performance that organizational performance can be realized. The workplace conditions will determine the employees' comfort to work and boost their performance (Nanzushi, 2015).

In an organization workplace environment factors and employees' performance have their own relations. The findings on the study done in Wollo university employees indicated in all workplace environment factors i.e., workplace physical environment, reward for employees, leadership style, training or development given for employees and work life balance of employees had positive linear relationship with their performance in the university. The result also showed that work life balance of employees and reward given for employees had strong linear association with their performance while the rest factors had weak positive linear relationship.

Employees' performance is deemed as a function of ability and motivation. From the study it can be concluded that the work life balance package of Wollo university employees contributes a statistically significant effect to employees' motivation to perform well. The employees want to be recognized for their work through fair work life balance. Fair work life balance will motivate employees to work harder and improve their performance.

The study findings support the two-factor theory which points out that the environment in which the job is performed motivates the employees to perform better. The study recommends that University need to set in place better work life balance and reward systems that motivate the employees to work hard.

Universities should also ensure that the workplace environment is comfortable enough to support employee performance by improving the working conditions. Improving the working environment will increase employee performance. When the work environmental supports are sound, employees are better equipped to do what is expected of them. Through this, they will achieve organizational goals. Employee

performance should be given serious attention by the university. Since the workplace environment factors are at the core of influencing employees' performance, these organizations should work hard at availing every needed resource in making sure that the work environment supports their employee performance.

6. Limitation

Doing research is not an easy task which creates many challenges. The study has certain limitations. The selection of work environment factors that influence employee performance is not exhaustive. There may be other factors that may influence employee performance that might provide more insight on employee performance. The used factors might not provide a clear image of the relationship between workplace environment factors and employee performance. Another limitation to the study is the vast number of colleges across the university. The researcher would have wished to carry out the study across all colleges and administrative staffs. But that was not possible due to constraints in time, finances and other related resources.

Declarations

Funding

This work was supported by [Wollo University]. Author Kidanie Aragaw has received research support from Business and Economics college.

Competing Interests

The author has no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

Author Contribution

The author contributed to the study conception and design. Material preparation, data collection and analysis were performed by the researcher. The first draft of the manuscript was also written by the researcher.

Ethics committee approval

All responsibility belongs to the researcher. All parties were involved in the research of their own free will.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the following SPSS data file:

Kidanie Aragaw Alemu is a research scholar and senior lecturer of Statistics in College of Natural Science, Wollo University, Dessie, Ethiopia. His area of research work focuses on employee performance. He has done different research works in health, education and sport sciences.

References

- Aisha, A., Hardjomidjojo, P., & Yassierli, A. (2013). Effects of working ability, working condition, motivation and incentive on employees multi-dimensional productivity. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 4(6), 1-5.
- Ajala, E. M. (2012). The influence of workplace environment on workers' welfare, performance and productivity.
- Ajila, C., & Abiola, A. (2004). Influence of rewards on workers performance in an organization. *Journal of social sciences*, 8(1), 7-12.
- Al-Anzi, N. M. (2009). Workplace Environment.
- Amusa, O. I., Iyoro, A. O., & Olabisi, A. F. (2013). Work environments and job performance of librarians in the public universities in South west Nigeria. *International Journal of Library and Information Science*, 5(11), 457-461.
- Armstrong, M. (2006). *A handbook of human resource management practice*. Kogan Page Publishers.
- Awoke, T. (2019). Effect of working Environment on employee performance: the case of Bole Lemi Industrial Park. Addis Ababa University. .
- Boles, M., Pelletier, B., & Lynch, W. (2004). The relationship between health risks and work productivity. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 46(7), 737-745.
- Briner, R. B. (2000). Relationships between work environments, psychological environments and psychological well-being. *Occupational medicine*, 50(5), 299-303.
- Chandrasekar, K. (2011). Workplace environment and its impact on organisational performance in public sector organisations. *International journal of enterprise computing and business systems*, 1(1), 1-19.
- Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human relations*, 53(6), 747-770.
- Duckett, H., & Macfarlane, E. (2003). Emotional intelligence and transformational leadership in retailing. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.

- El-Zeiny, R. M. A. (2013). Interior Design of Workplace and Performance Relationship: Private Sector Corporations in Egypt. *Asian Journal of Environment-Behavior Studies*, 4(11).
- Farh, C. I., Seo, M.-G., & Tesluk, P. E. (2012). Emotional intelligence, teamwork effectiveness, and job performance: The moderating role of job context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(4), 890.
- Frese, M., & Sonnentag, S. (2000). *High performance: An action theory approach*.
- Gitahi, N. S. (2014). *Effect of workplace environment on the performance of commercial banks employees in Nakuru town* [Kabarak University].
- Hameed, A., & Amjad, S. (2009). Impact of office design on employees productivity: a case study of banking organizations of Abbottabad, Pakistan.
- Hammer, T. H., Saksvik, P. Ø., Nytrø, K., Torvatn, H., & Bayazit, M. (2004). Expanding the psychosocial work environment: workplace norms and work-family conflict as correlates of stress and health. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 9(1), 83.
- Heath, V. (2006). Organization: Workplace environment & its impact on employee performance. *Obtained from-www. leader-values. com*.
- Herzberg, F. (1986). One more time: How do you motivate employees. *New York: The Leader Manager*, 433-448.
- Ketchen Jr, D. J., & Bergh, D. D. (2006). *Research methodology in strategy and management*. Emerald Group Publishing.
- Khan, S. H., Azhar, Z., Parveen, S., Naeem, F., & Sohail, M. M. (2011). Exploring the impact of infrastructure, pay incentives, and workplace environment on employees performance (A case study of Sargodha University). *Asian Journal of Empirical Research*, 2(4), 118-140.
- Leblebici, D. (2012). Impact of workplace quality on employee's productivity: case study of a bank in Turkey. *Journal of Business Economics and Finance*, 1(1), 38-49.
- Luna, B. (2017). The effect of working environment on employee performance: the case of Ayka Addis Textile and Investment group Plc. .
- Mugenda, O., & Mugenda, A. (2003). Quantitative and qualitative approaches. In: Nairobi: Acts Press.
- Mullins, L. J. (2006). Essentials of Organizational Behavior *Prentice Hall*, 183-190.
- Naharuddin, N., & Sadegi, M. (2013). Factors of workplace environment that affect employees performance: A case study of Miyazu Malaysia. *International journal of independent research and studies*, 2(2), 66-78.

- Nanzushi, C. (2015). *The effect of workplace environment on employee performance in the mobile telecommunication firms in Nairobi city county* University of Nairobi].
- Nel, P., Van Dyk, P., Haasbroek, G., Schultz, H., Sono, T., & Werner, A. (2004). *Human resources management*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Niemelä, R., Hannula, M., Rautio, S., Reijula, K., & Railio, J. (2002). The effect of air temperature on labour productivity in call centres—a case study. *Energy and buildings*, 34(8), 759-764.
- Pech, R., & Slade, B. (2006). Employee disengagement: is there evidence of a growing problem? *Handbook of Business Strategy*.
- Platt, & Sobotka. (2010). *Psychological Management of Individual Performance* John Wiley & Sons.
- Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 23(3), 257-266.
- Roelofsen, P. (2002). The impact of office environments on employee performance: The design of the workplace as a strategy for productivity enhancement. *Journal of facilities Management*.
- San, O. T., Theen, Y. M., & Heng, T. B. (2012). The reward strategy and performance measurement (evidence from Malaysian insurance companies). *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*, 2(1), 211-223.
- Shikdar, A. A., & Sawaqed, N. M. (2003). Worker productivity, and occupational health and safety issues in selected industries. *Computers & industrial engineering*, 45(4), 563-572.
- Storey, J. (2004). *Leadership in organizations: Current issues and key trends*. Psychology Press.
- Stup, R. (2003). Control the factors that influence employee success. *Managing the Hispanic Workforce Conference*. Cornell University and Pennsylvania State University,
- Teklehaimanot, A., Kitaw, Y., Girma, S., Seyoum, A., Desta, H., & Ye-Ebiyo, Y. (2007). Study of the working conditions of health extension workers in Ethiopia. *The Ethiopian Journal of Health Development*, 21(3).
- Thompson, E. R., & Phua, F. T. (2012). A brief index of affective job satisfaction. *Group & Organization Management*, 37(3), 275-307.
- Tripathi, A. (2014). Workplace environment: Consequences on employees. In: retrieved 05/08/2015 <http://www.linkedin.com/pulse>.
- Tzafirir, S. S. (2005). The relationship between trust, HRM practices and firm performance. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(9), 1600-1622.